arXiv:hep-th/0210308v2 19 Dec 2002

hep-th/0210308
SUSX-TH-02-025
UUITP-14/02

String theory and the Classical Stability of Plane Waves

D. Brecher$^\natural$, J. P. Gregory$^\flat$ and P. M. Saffin$^\sharp$

$^\natural$*Department of Physics and Astronomy*
University of British Columbia
Vancouver, British Columbia V6T 1Z1, Canada
`brecher@physics.ubc.ca`

$^\flat$*Department of Theoretical Physics*
Uppsala University, Box 803, SE-751 08 Uppsala, Sweden
`James.Gregory@teorfys.uu.se`

$^\sharp$*Centre for Theoretical Physics*
University of Sussex, Falmer, Brighton BN1 9QJ, U.K.
`mppk2@pact.cpes.susx.ac.uk`

Abstract

The presence of fields with negative mass–squared typically leads to some form of instability in standard field theories. The observation that, at least in the light–cone gauge, strings propagating in plane wave spacetimes can have worldsheet scalars with such tachyon–like masses suggests that the supergravity background may itself be unstable. To address this issue, we perform a perturbative analysis around the type IIB vacuum plane wave, the solution which most obviously generates worldsheet scalars with negative mass–squared. We argue that this background is perturbatively stable.

1 Introduction

It has been known for some time that plane–fronted, parallel gravitational waves (pp–waves) are exact solutions of string theory [1, 2, 3]. The same is true of pp–wave backgrounds with a non–trivial dilaton and null Neveu–Schwarz–Neveu–Schwarz (NS–NS) 3–form field strength [2, 3]. These backgrounds solve the β–function equations to all orders in α'. A particular class of pp–wave is the exact plane wave and in recent months the subject of plane waves in string theory has become an intense area of research, the reasons for this renaissance being as follows: after the discovery of maximally supersymmetric plane waves in eleven–dimensional [4, 5] and ten–dimensional type IIB [6] supergravity, it was observed [7, 8] that these solutions can be thought of as Penrose limits of the $\mathrm{AdS}_p \times S^{D-p}$ vacua of the respective theories. Despite the fact that the ten–dimensional case involves the Ramond–Ramond (R–R) 5–form, it was then shown [9, 10] that superstring theory on this background can be solved in the light–cone gauge. Finally, a sector of $\mathcal{N} = 4$ super–Yang–Mills (SYM) which is dual to string theory on this background was identified by Berenstein *et al* [11], for the first time allowing for truly stringy tests of, at least a special limit of, the AdS/CFT correspondence [12, 13, 14].

The Penrose limit [15] of any solution of the ten–dimensional supergravity theories [16] gives a plane wave, which preserves at least one–half of the supersymmetries, but sometimes more: for example, the Penrose limit of the $\mathrm{AdS}_5 \times T^{1,1}$ geometry, dual to a certain $\mathcal{N} = 1$ superconformal gauge theory [17], gives the same maximally supersymmetric plane wave [18, 19, 20]. Since this latter work, Penrose limits have been taken of a whole host of geometries which arise in string theory. Of most relevance to us are the plane waves one obtains by taking Penrose limits of the geometries dual to *non*–conformal gauge theories: the Pilch–Warner geometry [21, 22, 23], dual to an $\mathcal{N} = 1$ supersymmetric renormalization group (RG) flow between $\mathcal{N} = 4$ SYM and an $\mathcal{N} = 1$ superconformal infra–red (IR) fixed point [24, 25, 28]; the near–horizon limits of the Dp-brane geometries for $p \neq 3$ [25]; and various other relevant backgrounds [8, 20, 29, 30, 31, 32].

Issues concerning holography, even in the maximally supersymmetric example, remain mysterious [33, 34, 35, 36, 37]. Although both this [36] and more general plane waves [37], have a boundary which is a null line, it is not clear as to what the holographic theory actually is. It is thus even harder to address more general issues regarding RG flows in the plane wave limit, though in this context they have been discussed in [29, 33, 30, 38, 31]. Certain general statements can be made, however: the Penrose limit of a geometry dual to a non–conformal gauge theory results in a plane wave with a time–dependent profile. In light–cone gauge string theory, it is precisely this profile which gives a mass to the worldsheet scalars so, in this case, one generically finds simple harmonic oscillator modes with time–dependent masses [25].

Moreover, the Penrose limit of the near–horizon Dp-brane geometry for $p \neq 3$ gives rise to plane waves with profiles of the "wrong sign"; that is, which generate worldsheet scalars with negative (mass)^2 [25][1]. One might think that such terms signal instabilities although, since the "mass" of the worldsheet scalars is really only an artifact of the light–cone gauge [25, 39], this naïve thought may not be correct. Either way, the issues involved warrant further investigation.

Already in [28], it was noted that, for a certain range of parameters, one can generate what appear to be stringy instabilities in a plane wave background with non–trivial 3–form and 5–form field strengths. In this case, however, all the mass terms have the correct sign and the zero modes of the string are unaffected; one would thus not expect to see classical instabilities of the background. In fact, backgrounds with a non–trivial 3–form will prove to be too complicated to analyse in any detail here. Even in the maximally supersymmetric case, however, the dimensionless string theory Hamiltonian is [11, 10]

$$H = \sum_n \sqrt{n^2 + M^2}\; N_n, \tag{1.1}$$

where M denotes the dimensionless mass of the worldsheet scalars and N_n is the occupation number for each mode at level n. It would appear that switching the sign of M^2 will give rise to instabilities not only for stringy modes with $n \neq 0$, but also for the zero modes themselves[2]. And it is precisely these latter potential instabilities which one might expect to observe in a standard classical analysis.

Our purpose here is to assess the perturbative stability or otherwise of plane waves. That is, we will consider whether there exist solutions of the linearized field equations which grow exponentially in time. As far as we are aware, this is the first study of classical stability for non–static, though possibly stationary, spacetimes. Although we are only able to explicitly solve the relevant equations for the plane waves with *constant* profiles (the so–called Cahen–Wallach spaces [40]), this class of spacetimes certainly includes cases for which the (mass)^2 of the worldsheet scalars is negative. We will show that this class of plane waves does not exhibit classical instabilities. It would also seem that scalar field theory in this background is well–defined, in the sense that it too is stable [41].

In the following section, we briefly review pp– and plane waves in an arbitrary number of dimensions, commenting on some general properties relating to the issue of stability, including supersymmetry and particle production. We study the string theory dispersion relation in the ten–dimensional vacuum plane wave in section 3, to assess in what sense it shows signs of instabilities. In section 4, we compute the linearized vacuum field equations of type IIB supergravity, specialising to the light–cone gauge to restrict ourselves to purely physical degrees of freedom. The resulting equations are analysed in section 5. Our analysis of the metric perturbations is applicable to plane waves in any dimension, and that of the dilaton and form–field perturbations generalize fairly readily. We conclude in section 6.

---

[1] Further examples of the occurence of modes of negative (mass)^2 in Penrose limits of other supergravity solutions are studied in [26, 27].

[2] Of course, upon switching the sign of M^2, one loses maximal supersymmetry and it is not obvious that the Hamiltonian in this case is given by (1.1) with a simple sign difference. This is one of the issues we will address.

2 The spacetime

Consider the vacuum pp–wave solution in an arbitrary number of dimensions (in the following section we will specialize to waves of type IIB supergravity). The metric

$$\mathrm{d}s^2 = 2\mathrm{d}u\mathrm{d}v + H(u,x)\mathrm{d}u^2 + \mathrm{d}x^i\mathrm{d}x^i \qquad (i = 1, \ldots, D-2), \tag{2.1}$$

has curvature

$$R_{uiuj} = -\frac{1}{2}\partial_i\partial_j H, \qquad R_{uu} = -\frac{1}{2}\partial_i\partial_i H, \tag{2.2}$$

and scalar Laplacian

$$\Box = 2\partial_u\partial_v - H(u,x)\partial_v^2 + \partial_i\partial_i, \tag{2.3}$$

where we should note that we will not distinguish between upper and lower transverse indices. In general, the only isometry of this spacetime is that generated by the null Killing vector $\partial/\partial v$.

Taking $\epsilon = 0$ for null geodesics, $\epsilon = 1$ for timelike geodesics, and with λ denoting the affine parameter, this isometry gives rise to a conserved energy, E:

$$u(\lambda) = E\lambda + u_0. \tag{2.4}$$

The constraint $\text{Ł} = -\epsilon$ is used to solve for v: with a dot denoting differentiation with respect to λ, we have

$$v(\lambda) = -\frac{1}{2E}\int \left(\epsilon + H(u,x)E^2 + \dot{x}^i\dot{x}^i\right)\mathrm{d}\lambda + v_0, \tag{2.5}$$

where the transverse coordinates satisfy

$$\ddot{x}^i = \frac{1}{2}\partial_i H E^2. \tag{2.6}$$

For the plane wave, with $H(u,x) = -A_{ij}(u)x^i x^j$, one can solve this equation for arbitrary initial conditions $x^i(0)$ and $\dot{x}^i(0)$.

The general pp–wave is singular, albeit in a special sense since all curvature invariants vanish identically [2, 3]. To see this, one constructs an orthonormal frame which is parallelly propagated along a time–like geodesic, with tangent vector

$$T^a = \left(E, \dot{v}, \dot{x}^i\right). \tag{2.7}$$

The unit normals

$$n^a_{(i)} = \left(0, -\frac{\dot{x}^i}{E}, \delta^i_{(i)}\right), \qquad m^a = \left(E, \dot{v} + \frac{1}{E}, \dot{x}^i\right), \tag{2.8}$$

all obey $(T \cdot \nabla n)^a = 0$, as required for a parallelly propagated frame of reference. The non–zero components of the Riemann curvature with respect to this frame of reference,

$$R_{(T)(i)(T)(j)} \equiv R_{abcd}T^a n^b_{(i)} T^c n^d_{(j)} = -\frac{E^2}{2}\partial_i\partial_j H, \tag{2.9}$$

$$R_{(m)(i)(m)(j)} \equiv R_{abcd}m^a n^b_{(i)} m^c n^d_{(j)} = -\frac{E^2}{2}\partial_i\partial_j H, \tag{2.10}$$

will generically diverge. If such a divergence occurs at some point in the spacetime, then an observer will encounter infinite tidal forces at that point, and the space is geodesically *in*complete[3]. The only *non–singular* pp–wave [2, 3] is the plane wave, for which

$$H(u,x) = -A_{ij}(u)x^i x^j, \tag{2.11}$$

where $A_{ij}(u)$ is a *smooth* function of u. (For constant A_{ij}, this is a Lorentzian symmetric space [40, 6].) In this case,

$$R_{(T)(i)(T)(j)} = R_{(m)(i)(m)(j)} = E^2 A_{ij}(u), \tag{2.12}$$

and the tidal force is attractive for positive eigenvalues of A_{ij} and repulsive for negative eigenvalues. It might appear that this notion of a singularity is observer–dependent, but this is not the case since the tidal force, divergent or otherwise, would be experienced by *all* time–like observers. Indeed, one can show that the metric function $A_{ij}(u)$ encodes diffeomorphism–invariant properties of the spacetime [41].

The nature of the tidal force is seen in the geodesics also. The vacuum field equation is simply

$$\mathrm{tr} A(u) = 0, \tag{2.13}$$

and, for constant A_{ij}, we can always diagonalize, taking $A_{ij} = \lambda_{(i)}\delta_{ij}$. Then there must be at least one negative eigenvalue, and we can write $\lambda_{(i)} = \pm\mu^2_{(i)}$. The geodesic equations for this simple case are easily solved: u and v are as in (2.4) and (2.5), and

$$x^i = A^i \cos(\mu_{(i)}E\lambda) + B^i \sin(\mu_{(i)}E\lambda) \qquad (\lambda_{(i)} = \mu^2_{(i)}), \tag{2.14}$$

$$x^i = A^i \exp(\mu_{(i)}E\lambda) + B^i \exp(-\mu_{(i)}E\lambda) \qquad (\lambda_{(i)} = -\mu^2_{(i)}). \tag{2.15}$$

The attractive tidal force in the first case gives oscillatory behaviour around the origin, and the repulsive tidal force in the latter case gives geodesics which are pushed off to infinity. In this sense, the vacuum spacetime exhibits an instability (and we will see the same behaviour in the zero modes of the string in this background below). This behaviour is reminiscent of de Sitter space, in which particles also accelerate forever and, just as in that case, the repulsive tidal force in the directions associated with negative eigenvalues does not necessarily give rise to instabilities in the usual sense[4]. In the case of de Sitter space, stability is guaranteed by the "cosmic no hair" conjecture [48, 49, 50], and one might wonder if there is a similar argument for the case of the plane wave.

---

[3] It is amusing to note that one encounters these "pp–curvature singularities" in the solutions describing pp–waves on fundamental strings [42, 43, 44, 45], and also in non–dilatonic "brane–wave" solutions of ten– and eleven–dimensional supergravity [46]. In that case, even the exact plane waves give rise to such curvature singularities at the would–be horizon of the brane. Presumably, the related solutions considered in [47] have a similar global structure.

[4] The Penrose limit of pure de Sitter space is just flat space, as for pure anti–de Sitter space [8]. Although such a spacetime is not a solution of any known supergravity theory, if we consider the Penrose limit of de Sitter space times a sphere, along a geodesic which has angular momentum on the sphere, then we do find negative eigenvalues coming from the de Sitter directions.

Since all such plane waves are at least one–half supersymmetric, one might be tempted to argue that they *must* be stable. However, the extent to which the standard arguments [51, 52, 53, 54] concerning stability and supersymmetry apply here is unclear. After all, the spacetime is not asymptotically flat. Moreover, the supersymmetries common to all such plane waves do not commute with the Hamiltonian. One can thus write down one–half supersymmetric configurations which nevertheless do *not* solve the relevant field equations [55]. However, demanding extra or, in the language of [56, 57], supernumerary, supersymmetries does restrict one to solutions of the field equations; and indeed it would seem that any such solution which preserves more than one–half of the supersymmetries does not give rise to the potential problems alluded to above. For example, it is fairly easy to see that waves with time–dependent profiles never have such supernumerary supersymmetries.

More explicitly, the integrability condition for the existence of Killing spinors is

$$[D_u, D_i]\epsilon = \frac{1}{4}\partial_i\partial_j H \ \Gamma_j\Gamma_+\epsilon = 0, \tag{2.16}$$

and multiplying this from the left with Γ_i gives

$$\partial_i\partial_i H \ \Gamma_+\epsilon = 0, \tag{2.17}$$

where $\partial_i\partial_i H = 0$ is the field equation. One can thus have the standard supersymmetries, satisfying $\Gamma_+\epsilon = 0$, without solving the field equation. Supernumerary supersymmetries, however, have $\Gamma_+\epsilon \neq 0$ so, if any of these are to exist, the field equation must be satisfied. Of course, in this vacuum example, there are no supernumerary supersymmetries anyway. In the more general case with background fluxes, it is true that the existence of supernumerary supersymmetries implies the field equations, but this is harder to see. One has to consider the Killing spinor equation directly, in addition to the variation of any other fermionic fields, for example the dilatino in type IIB supergravity. An analogous study of the integrability condition for the existence of Killing spinors in this more general case is not enough[5].

Further general comments are in order with respect to particle production in these backgrounds. It is easy to see that Gibbons' original argument [58] — that there is no production of massless scalars in the sandwich wave — can be generalized to *any* pp–wave (see, *e.g.*, [2, 3]). Given that $\partial/\partial v$ generates an isometry, we can always decompose the modes of a scalar field in the pp–wave background with respect to v, as

$$\phi(u, v, x) = e^{ip_- v}\tilde{\phi}(u, x). \tag{2.18}$$

To determine whether there is particle production, we need to consider whether the "in" modes in the asymptotic past are orthogonal to the "out" modes in the asymptotic future[6]. The Klein–Gordon scalar product is

---

[5] We thank the anonymous referee for pointing out the problems with our original argument in this case.

$$(\phi, \psi) = -i \int_{\Sigma} \mathrm{d}\Sigma^a \sqrt{g_{\Sigma}}\, \phi \overset{\leftrightarrow}{\partial_a} \psi^*, \tag{2.19}$$

where Σ is the null surface $u = 0$, with unit normal $\partial/\partial v$. Despite the fact that these spacetimes are not globally hyperbolic [59] (see also [37]), this is a good substitute for a Cauchy surface [58]: it fails to capture only those geodesics moving parallel to the wave, with $u =$ constant, and these will never interact with the wave itself. Explicitly, we have [58]

$$(\phi, \psi) = -i \int_{\Sigma} \mathrm{d}v \mathrm{d}^{D-2}x\, \phi \overset{\leftrightarrow}{\partial_v} \psi^*, \tag{2.20}$$

so the mode functions are always orthogonal, since they are simple exponentials in v. For any pp–wave, the null Killing vector $\partial/\partial v$ allows for a preferred notion of frequency, so there can be no particle production and the resulting Bogoliubov coefficients must vanish.

One might then argue that scalar fields in the pp–wave background are always stable, since presumably an instability in such a field will cause runaway particle production. What is less clear is whether this implies stability of the background itself (some comments in [60] seem to be make this connection). One should also consider what effects interactions have [41].

3 String theory on the plane wave

Of course, the zero modes of a string in the plane wave background will follow the same geodesics as above but we should also consider the non–zero modes to see what effect, if any, they have. Moreover, it would appear from (1.1) that the zero modes themselves will give rise to instabilities for negative eigenvalues of the metric function A_{ij}, and it is this issue that we want to address here. Ultimately, we are interested in whether or not there are tachyonic modes of the string (or particle) in the plane wave background. Since the notion of "mass" in this case is not the same as in flat space, we will ask the question as to whether there is faster–than–light propagation of any modes. It would appear that there *is* though, again, in a similar way as for de Sitter space.

Since we are still working with the vacuum solution, the worldsheet fermions are unchanged from the usual flat space results. In the light–cone gauge, they are affected only by background fluxes [10]. Indeed, since the vacuum backgrounds are necessarily only one–half supersymmetric, there are no linearly realized worldsheet supersymmetries at all — after fixing the kappa–symmetry, only supernumerary supersymmetries are linearly realized [39]. Then it should not be surprising that, whereas the worldsheet scalars are massive, the fermions will still be massless. We will thus consider only bosonic string theory here.

---

[6] In the case of the sandwich wave, in the asymptotic past and future, the spacetime is flat and the obvious "in" and "out" states can be constructed [58]. More generally, one can imagine [25] an RG flow from some constant A_{ij} to some other constant A_{ij} in which case one can define "in" and "out" states in these stationary regions of spacetime.

The action

$$S = -\frac{1}{4\pi\alpha'} \int \mathrm{d}\sigma \mathrm{d}\tau \sqrt{-h} h^{\alpha\beta} \partial_\alpha X^a \partial_\beta X^b g_{ab}, \tag{3.1}$$

with background metric

$$\mathrm{d}s^2 = 2\mathrm{d}u\mathrm{d}v - A_{ij}(u) x^i x^j \mathrm{d}u^2 + \mathrm{d}x^i \mathrm{d}x^i \qquad (i = 1, \ldots, 8), \tag{3.2}$$

has the energy–momentum tensor

$$T_{\alpha\beta} = -\frac{1}{\alpha'} \left(\partial_\alpha X^a \partial_\beta X^b g_{ab} - \frac{1}{2} h_{\alpha\beta} \partial X^a \cdot \partial X^b g_{ab} \right), \tag{3.3}$$

and canonical momenta

$$P_- = \frac{\partial Ł}{\partial \dot{V}} = \frac{1}{l_s^2} \dot{U}, \tag{3.4}$$

$$P_+ = \frac{\partial Ł}{\partial \dot{U}} = \frac{1}{l_s^2} \left(\dot{V} - A_{ij} X^i X^j \dot{U} \right), \tag{3.5}$$

$$P_i = \frac{\partial Ł}{\partial \dot{X}^i} = \frac{1}{l_s^2} \dot{X}^i. \tag{3.6}$$

where $l_s^2 = 2\pi\alpha'$. The V equation implies that $\Box U = 0$, so taking $U = U(\tau)$, we have

$$U = l_s^2 P_- \tau + U_0, \tag{3.7}$$

which is the light–cone gauge. In that case, the constraint $T_{00} = 0$ gives, upon substitution of the momenta,

$$-2P_+P_- = P_-^2 A_{ij} X^i X^j + P_i P_i + \frac{\partial_\sigma X^i \partial_\sigma X^i}{l_s^4}. \tag{3.8}$$

V is given implicitly by the constraint, leaving the transverse coordinates as the physical degrees of freedom. Taking the metric function $A_{ij} = \lambda_{(i)} \delta_{ij}$, and defining the dimensionless mass $M_{(i)} = \mu_{(i)} l_s^2 P_-$, we have

$$\Box X^i \mp M_{(i)}^2 X^i = 0 \qquad (\lambda_{(i)} = \pm \mu_{(i)}^2). \tag{3.9}$$

Consider, first, the zero modes:

$$X_0^i(\tau) = x^i \cos\left(M_{(i)}\tau\right) + \frac{\alpha'}{M_{(i)}} \sin\left(M_{(i)}\tau\right) p^i \qquad (\lambda_{(i)} = \mu_{(i)}^2), \tag{3.10}$$

$$X_0^i(\tau) = x^i \cosh\left(M_{(i)}\tau\right) + \frac{\alpha'}{M_{(i)}} \sinh\left(M_{(i)}\tau\right) p^i \qquad (\lambda_{(i)} = -\mu_{(i)}^2), \tag{3.11}$$

which of course match the geodesics (2.14) and (2.15) above. The centre–of–mass of the string will thus oscillate about the origin of those directions associated with positive eigenvalues, and will accelerate forever in the directions associated with negative eigenvalues.

The non–zero modes are solved for by making the Ansatz

$$X^i(\tau, \sigma) = \sum_{n \neq 0} C_n^i e^{i(\omega_n \tau + n\sigma)}, \tag{3.12}$$

giving

$$\omega_n^2 = n^2 \pm M_{(i)}^2 \qquad (\lambda_{(i)} = \pm\mu_{(i)}^2), \tag{3.13}$$

For negative eigenvalues, the set of modes with $|n| < M_{(i)}$ have $\omega_n^2 < 0$. As in the more general case considered in [28], some of the ω_n become imaginary, and would seem to correspond to unstable modes. However, this is an instability with respect to mode creation on the string worldsheet, in precisely the sense of [2, 3], and not in the sense that we are concerned with here. We do not expect to see truly stringy instabilities in our perturbative analysis. Again as in [28], these stringy instabilities exist only for some range of n. In particular, we have unstable modes only if

$$\mu_{(i)} P_- > T, \tag{3.14}$$

$T = 1/l_s^2$ being the string tension. Unstable modes only appear if either the light–cone momentum of the string, or the curvature of the background, is large with respect to the string scale (the same is true in the more general case considered in [28]).

In the directions associated with positive eigenvalues, the oscillator modes are given by [10]

$$X^i = i\sqrt{\frac{\alpha'}{2}} \sum_{n\neq 0} \frac{1}{\omega_n} \left(\alpha_n^i e^{in\sigma} + \tilde{\alpha}_n^i e^{-in\sigma}\right) e^{-i\omega_n \tau}, \tag{3.15}$$

where, for $n > 0$, $\omega_n = \sqrt{n^2 + M_{(i)}^2}$ and, to ensure reality,

$$\omega_{-n} = -\omega_n, \qquad \left(\alpha_n^i\right)^\dagger = \alpha_{-n}^i, \qquad \left(\tilde{\alpha}_n^i\right)^\dagger = \tilde{\alpha}_{-n}^i. \tag{3.16}$$

In the remaining directions, associated with negative eigenvalues, we have

$$X^i = i\sqrt{\frac{\alpha'}{2}} \sum_{|n|>M_{(i)}} \frac{1}{\omega_n} \left(\alpha_n^i e^{in\sigma} + \tilde{\alpha}_n^i e^{-in\sigma}\right) e^{-i\omega_n \tau} + \sqrt{\frac{\alpha'}{2}} \sum_{|n|<M_{(i)}} \frac{1}{\Omega_n} \left(\beta_n^i e^{in\sigma} + \left(\beta_n^i\right)^\dagger e^{-in\sigma}\right) e^{\Omega_n \tau}, \tag{3.17}$$

where, for $n > 0$, $\omega_n = \sqrt{n^2 - M_{(i)}^2}$, and the same conditions as in (3.16) apply to ensure reality. The β_n^i operators are associated with the exponentially growing/decaying modes and we have set $\omega_n = i\Omega_n$ for $|n| < M_{(i)}$ where, for $n > 0$, $\Omega_n = \sqrt{M_{(i)}^2 - n^2}$. Then the expansion for the unstable modes is manifestly real. To include all the relevant modes in this case, we also set $\Omega_{-n} = -\Omega_n$.

The non–vanishing Poisson brackets are then

$$\begin{gathered} \left[x^i, p^j\right]_{PB} = \delta^{ij}, \\ [\alpha_m^i, \alpha_n^j]_{PB} = [\tilde{\alpha}_m^i, \tilde{\alpha}_n^j]_{PB} = -i\omega_m \delta_{m+n,0}\delta^{ij}, \\ [\beta_m^i, \beta_n^j]_{PB} = [\left(\beta_m^i\right)^\dagger, \left(\beta_n^j\right)^\dagger]_{PB} = \Omega_m \delta_{m+n,0}\delta^{ij}. \end{gathered} \tag{3.18}$$

Upon quantisation, the modes with real ω_n will give rise to the usual harmonic oscillators, but those with imaginary ω_n have an extra factor of i. In other words, the β_n^i do not correspond to harmonic oscillators, rather they are associated with the unstable worldsheet modes.

Substituting for the mode expansions of the worldsheet scalars and the respective momenta into (3.8) gives

$$-2(2\pi)^2 P_+ P_- = (2\pi)^2 P_-^2 \lambda_{(i)} x^i x^i + p^i p^i + \frac{1}{\alpha'} \sum_{n\neq 0} \left(\alpha_n^i \alpha_{-n}^i + \tilde{\alpha}_n^i \tilde{\alpha}_{-n}^i \right)$$
$$+ \frac{1}{\alpha'} \sum_{|n|<M_{(i)}} \left(\beta_n^i \beta_{-n}^i + \left(\beta_n^i\right)^\dagger \left(\beta_{-n}^i\right)^\dagger \right), \tag{3.19}$$

where the first oscillator sum runs over all directions associated with positive eigenvalues, and over those modes for which $|n| > M_{(i)}$ in the directions associated with negative eigenvalues. The second sum applies to the latter directions only. The P_-^2 contribution comes from the zero modes, so would also be present in the case of a particle. In either case, it is not at all obvious as to how this dispersion relation gives us information on what our flat–space intuition would call a "mass". In flat space, we have

$$-2P_+ = \frac{1}{P_-} \left(p^i p^i + \text{oscillators} \right), \tag{3.20}$$

which gives well–defined behaviour; in particular, $P_+ \to 0$ as $P_- \to \infty$, so that we never have faster–than–light propagation. In the case at hand, however, we have

$$-2P_+ = P_- \lambda_{(i)} x^i x^i + \frac{1}{P_-} \left(p^i p^i + \text{oscillators} \right), \tag{3.21}$$

the non–standard dependence on P_- giving rise to "unstable" behaviour: depending on the sign of $\lambda_{(i)}$, we have $P_+ \to \pm\infty$ as either $P_- \to \infty$ or $\mu_{(i)} \to \infty$. In either case, we know that in this limit, only the zero modes survive, since all the stringy modes with $n > 0$ are unstable; the string is literally ripped apart. Note that modes with small P_- behave as if they have a positive mass, so in this infra–red regime, there are no tachyonic excitations.

At any rate, based on flat–space intuition it would appear that we either have slower–than–light or faster–than–light propagation depending on this sign. Negative eigenvalues seem to give tachyonic behaviour, but this is presumably to be expected since particles (and strings) accelerate forever. Even so, we will not find any unstable modes in the analysis below. As we will see, the problem in this simple case reduces to the quantum mechanics of the inverted oscillator in which similar behaviour is observed: quantum particles accelerate forever, but the system is perturbatively stable. Various subtleties concerning this dispersion relation are addressed in [41], where it is argued that imposing boundary conditions at some finite $x^i x^i = L^2$ effectively removes the problems associated with large P_-.

To make contact with (1.1), we rescale

$$\alpha_n^i = \sqrt{\omega_n} a_n^i, \qquad \alpha_{-n}^i = \sqrt{\omega_n} \bar{a}_n^i, \qquad \beta_n^i = \sqrt{\Omega_n}, \qquad \beta_{-n}^i = \sqrt{\Omega_n} \bar{b}_n^i, \tag{3.22}$$

and likewise for the $\tilde{\alpha}$ and $\beta^\dagger$, and combine the zero modes as

$$a_0^i = \frac{1}{\sqrt{M_{(i)}\alpha'}} \left(\alpha' p^i - i M_{(i)} x^i \right), \qquad \bar{a}_0^i = \frac{1}{\sqrt{M_{(i)}\alpha'}} \left(\alpha' p^i + i M_{(i)} x^i \right). \tag{3.23}$$

Upon quantisation, the new operators obey

$$[a^i_0, \bar{a}^j_0] = \delta^{ij}, \qquad [a^i_m, \bar{a}^j_n] = \delta_{mn}\delta^{ij}, \qquad [b^i_m, \bar{b}^j_n] = i\delta_{mn}\delta^{ij}, \tag{3.24}$$

and likewise for the $\tilde{\alpha}$ and $\beta^\dagger$, and we have

$$-2P_+P_- = \frac{1}{\alpha'}\sum_i \left(M_{(i)} N^{(i)}_0 + \sum_{n>0} \omega^{(i)}_n N^{(i)}_n + \sum_{|n|<M_{(i)}} \Omega^{(i)}_n \hat{N}^{(i)}_n \right), \tag{3.25}$$

where $M_{(i)} = \pm\mu_{(i)} l_s^2 P_-$, $\omega^i_n = \sqrt{n^2 + M^2_{(i)}}$, $N^{(i)}_n = a^i_n \bar{a}^i_n + \tilde{a}^i_n \bar{\tilde{a}}^i_n$ and $\hat{N}^{(i)}_n = b^i_n \bar{b}^i_n + (b^i_n)^\dagger (\bar{b}^i_n)^\dagger$.

4 Linearized field equations

We will consider perturbations of the type IIB version of the vacuum plane wave discussed in section 2. We have some results regarding the non–vacuum solution, but will not discuss them here since this case is much harder to analyse in any detail. Moreover, the vacuum solution is the cleanest in which possible negative (mass)^2 terms are generated on the string worldsheet.

The field content of the bosonic sector of type IIB supergravity is: a complex scalar, $\Phi = \chi + ie^{-\phi}$, combining the axion and dilaton, χ and ϕ; a complex 2–form potential with field strength

$$G_3 = \mathrm{d}A_2 = H_3 + iF_3, \tag{4.1}$$

combining the NS–NS and R–R 3–form field strengths, H_3 and F_3; and an R–R 4-form potential with self–dual field strength

$$F_5 = \star F_5 = \mathrm{d}C_4 - \frac{1}{8}\Im\left(A_2 \wedge G_3^*\right), \tag{4.2}$$

where $*$ denotes complex conjugation and $\star$ denotes ten–dimensional Hodge duality. We take the field equations from [61], perturbations of which, in a vacuum background, simplify dramatically.

4.1 Scalar perturbations

Throughout the analysis we will find ourselves solving the field equations similar to those for a massless scalar, so consider the complex scalar, Φ, which satisfies

$$\Box\Phi = 0. \tag{4.3}$$

We want to look for instabilities, *i.e.* modes which grow exponentially in time, where "time" is u. We will also demand that the modes are normalizable — either L^2 normalizable or delta–function normalizable — in v and all transverse directions. We have already discussed above that we can always decompose the modes with respect to the Killing vector $\partial/\partial v$, so we make the Ansatz

$$\Phi = e^{i(p_- v - p_+ u)}\mathcal{F}(x), \tag{4.4}$$

where $\mathcal{F}(x) = \phi_1(x) + i\phi_2(x)$ depends on all transverse coordinates. Then

$$\Box\Phi = e^{i(p_- v - p_+ u)} \left[(2p_- p_+ + H(u,x)p_-^2)\mathcal{F}(x) + \partial_k\partial_k\mathcal{F}(x) \right] . \tag{4.5}$$

We assume that p_- is real, else the modes will not be normalizable in the v direction, and unstable modes will have imaginary p_+. Our approach will be to consider those modes with real p_+ and show that in fact this includes all modes with real momentum p_-, so

$$[2p_- p_+ + H(u,x)p_-^2]\phi(x) + \partial_k\partial_k\phi(x) = 0, \tag{4.6}$$

for both $\phi = \phi_1$ and $\phi = \phi_2$. We will see that precisely the same equation controls the perturbations of all supergravity fields, and will analyse the solutions in the following section.

4.2 Metric perturbations

As usual in perturbation theory, we need to choose a gauge to restrict ourselves to physical degrees of freedom. Although the standard transverse, trace–free gauge considerably simplifies the linearized field equations, this choice does not entirely fix the gauge. We will rather make use of the light–cone gauge, which is well–suited to our background spacetime; but also has the advantage of fixing the gauge freedom entirely. The field equation[7] is $\delta R_{ab} = 0$.

The light–cone gauge is defined by

$$h_{va} = 0, \qquad \forall \ a, \tag{4.7}$$

and substituting for this gives

$$\begin{aligned}
-2\delta R_{uu} &= \Box h_{uu} - 2\partial_u(\partial_v h_{uu} + \partial_i h_{iu}) - \partial_i\partial_j H h_{ij} - 2\partial_i H \partial_j h_{ij}, && (4.8)\\
-2\delta R_{uv} &= -\partial_v(\partial_v h_{uu} + \partial_i h_{iu}), && (4.9)\\
-2\delta R_{ui} &= \Box h_{ui} + \partial_j H \partial_v h_{ij} - \partial_i(\partial_v h_{uu} + \partial_j h_{ju}), && (4.10)\\
-2\delta R_{vv} &= \partial_v^2 h_{ii}, && (4.11)\\
-2\delta R_{vi} &= -\partial_v(\partial_v h_{iu} + \partial_j h_{ij}), && (4.12)\\
-2\delta R_{ij} &= \Box h_{ij}. && (4.13)
\end{aligned}$$

For the maximally supersymmetric plane wave, these results were effectively derived in [10, 33]. As in that case, the equations $\delta R_{va} = 0$ appear as constraints, which we solve by taking

$$h_{ii} = 0, \qquad \partial_v h_{iu} + \partial_j h_{ij} = 0, \qquad \partial_v h_{uu} + \partial_i h_{iu} = 0, \tag{4.14}$$

---

[7] One often thinks of the linearized vacuum field equation to be the vanishing of the Lichnerowicz operator [62] acting on the metric perturbations. This is true only in the transverse, trace–free gauge however. That is $\nabla_{\mathrm{L}} h_{ab} = -2\delta R_{ab}$ only if $h = g^{ab}h_{ab} = \nabla_b h^b_a = 0$. Since we will not be working in this gauge, our vacuum field equation is $\delta R_{ab} = 0$, and not $\nabla_{\mathrm{L}} h_{ab} = 0$.

which leaves the equations

$$\Box h_{ij} = 0, \tag{4.15}$$

$$\Box h_{iu} + \partial_j H \partial_v h_{ij} = 0, \tag{4.16}$$

$$\Box h_{uu} - \partial_i \partial_j H h_{ij} - 2\partial_i H \partial_j h_{ij} = 0. \tag{4.17}$$

We thus need only solve

$$\Box h_{ij} = 0, \tag{4.18}$$

all other components of h_{ab} following from h_{ij} *via* the constraints (4.14). Working in the light–cone gauge reduces the degrees of freedom to the physical ones only, the transverse components h_{ij}, minus the trace.

We make the Ansatz

$$h_{ij} = \Re\left\{\xi_{ij}\ e^{i(p_- v - p_+ u)}\mathcal{F}(x)\right\}, \tag{4.19}$$

where, as in the previous subsection, $\mathcal{F}(x) = \phi_1(x) + i\phi_2(x)$. $\xi_{ij} = \xi_{(ij)}$ denotes a constant polarisation tensor which satisfies $\xi_{ii} = 0$. Again we consider modes normalizable in v (real p_-) with real p_+. Then

$$\Box h_{ij} = \Re\left\{\xi_{ij} e^{i(p_- v - p_+ u)}\left[(2p_- p_+ + H(u,x)p_-^2)\mathcal{F}(x) + \partial_k\partial_k\mathcal{F}(x)\right]\right\} = 0. \tag{4.20}$$

Writing this in terms of real and imaginary parts, we have

$$[2p_- p_+ + H(u,x)p_-^2]\phi(x) + \partial_k\partial_k\phi(x) = 0, \tag{4.21}$$

for both $\phi = \phi_1$ and $\phi = \phi_2$, just as in (4.6) above.

The constraints (4.14) give

$$h_{iu} = \Re\left\{\frac{i}{p_-}\xi_{ij}\ e^{i(p_- v - p_+ u)}\partial_j\mathcal{F}(x)\right\}, \qquad h_{uu} = -\Re\left\{\frac{1}{p_-^2}\xi_{ij}\ e^{i(p_- v - p_+ u)}\partial_i\partial_j\mathcal{F}(x)\right\}, \tag{4.22}$$

though we still need to check for consistency with the field equations (4.16) and (4.17). Substituting for the above results, we find

$$(4.16) \quad \Rightarrow \quad \Re\left\{\frac{i}{p_-}\xi_{ij}\ e^{i(p_- v - p_+ u)}\partial_j\left[(2p_- p_+ + H(u,x)p_-^2)\mathcal{F}(x) + \partial_k\partial_k\mathcal{F}(x)\right]\right\} = 0, \tag{4.23}$$

$$(4.17) \quad \Rightarrow \quad \Re\left\{\frac{1}{p_-^2}\xi_{ij}\ e^{i(p_- v - p_+ u)}\partial_i\partial_j\left[(2p_- p_+ + H(u,x)p_-^2)\mathcal{F}(x) + \partial_k\partial_k\mathcal{F}(x)\right]\right\} = 0, \tag{4.24}$$

so consistency is guaranteed and we need only take ϕ_1 and ϕ_2 to satisfy (4.6). Solutions of this equation thus fix *all* metric perturbations.

4.3 4–form perturbations

In addition to (4.7), we now also impose

$$\delta C_{vabc} = 0, \qquad \forall \;\; a, b, c, \tag{4.25}$$

so that

$$\delta F_{va_1 \dots a_4} = \partial_v \delta C_{a_1 \dots a_4}. \tag{4.26}$$

Perturbing the self–duality condition $F_5 = \star F_5$ gives

$$\delta F_{vi_1 \dots i_4} = -\frac{1}{4!} \varepsilon_{i_1 \dots i_4 j_1 \dots j_4} \delta F_{vj_1 \dots j_4}, \tag{4.27}$$

$$\delta F_{uvijk} = \frac{1}{5!} \varepsilon_{ijki_1 \dots i_5} \delta F_{i_1 \dots i_5}, \tag{4.28}$$

$$\delta F_{ui_1 \dots i_4} = \frac{1}{4!} \varepsilon_{i_1 \dots i_4 j_1 \dots j_4} \delta F_{uj_1 \dots j_4}, \tag{4.29}$$

where $\varepsilon_{i_1 \dots i_8} = \varepsilon_{uvi_1 \dots i_8}$. The 4–form potential is anti–self–dual in eight dimensions, since (4.27) gives

$$\delta C_{i_1 \dots i_4} = -\frac{1}{4!} \varepsilon_{i_1 \dots i_4 j_1 \dots j_4} \delta C_{j_1 \dots j_4}. \tag{4.30}$$

Furthermore, (4.28) is just the constraint

$$\partial_v \delta C_{uijk} + \partial_l \delta C_{lijk} = 0, \tag{4.31}$$

which can be solved for δC_{uijk}.

The 4–form equation of motion is

$$\nabla^e \delta F_{eabcd} = 0, \tag{4.32}$$

the $\{u, v, i, j\}$ component of which can be solved by taking

$$\partial_k \delta C_{kuij} = 0, \tag{4.33}$$

and the $\{v, i, j, k\}$ component gives the constraint (4.31). The remaining components are

$$\Box \delta C_{ijkl} = 0, \tag{4.34}$$

$$\Box \delta C_{uijk} + \partial_l H \partial_v \delta C_{lijk} = 0, \tag{4.35}$$

and, again, we will see below that the solution for δC_{uijk} found from the constraint (4.31) is consistent with this field equation.

Since the 4–form is real, we make a similar Ansatz to (4.19) above:

$$\delta C_{ijkl} = \Re \left\{ \epsilon_{ijkl} \; e^{i(p_- v - p_+ u)} \mathcal{F}(x) \right\}, \tag{4.36}$$

where

$$\epsilon_{i_1\dots i_4} = -\frac{1}{4!}\varepsilon_{i_1\dots i_4 j_1\dots j_4}\epsilon_{j_1\dots j_4}, \tag{4.37}$$

is a constant polarisation tensor, anti–self–dual in eight dimensions, and $\mathcal{F}(x) = \phi_1(x) + i\phi_2(x)$. Then

$$\Box\delta C_{ijkl} = \Re\left\{\epsilon_{ijkl}\ e^{i(p_- v - p_+ u)}\left[(2p_-p_+ + H(u,x)p_-^2)\mathcal{F}(x) + \partial_m\partial_m\mathcal{F}(x)\right]\right\} = 0. \tag{4.38}$$

The constraint (4.31) gives

$$\delta C_{uijkl} = \Re\left\{\frac{i}{p_-}\epsilon_{lijk}\ e^{i(p_- v - p_+ u)}\partial_l F(x)\right\}, \tag{4.39}$$

so that (4.33) is an identity, and substituting this into the field equation (4.35) gives

$$\Re\left\{\frac{i}{p_-}\epsilon_{lijk}\ e^{i(p_- v - p_+ u)}\partial_l\left[(2p_-p_+ + H(u,x)p_-^2)\mathcal{F}(x) + \partial_m\partial_m\mathcal{F}(x)\right]\right\} = 0. \tag{4.40}$$

Again, both $\phi = \phi_1$ and $\phi = \phi_2$ must satisfy (4.6).

4.4 2–form perturbations

The 2–form perturbations go through in the same way as the for the 4–form above, the only difference being that they are complex. Taking

$$\delta A_{va} = 0, \qquad \forall\ a \tag{4.41}$$

gives

$$\delta G_{vab} = \partial_v\delta A_{ab}. \tag{4.42}$$

The equation of motion is

$$\nabla^c\delta G_{cab} = 0, \tag{4.43}$$

the $\{u,v\}$ and $\{v,i\}$ components of which are constraints which can be solved by taking

$$\partial_i\delta A_{iu} = 0, \qquad \partial_v\delta A_{ui} + \partial_j\delta A_{ji} = 0. \tag{4.44}$$

This leaves

$$\Box\delta A_{ij} = 0, \tag{4.45}$$

$$\Box\delta A_{ui} + \partial_j H\partial_v\delta A_{ji} = 0, \tag{4.46}$$

the structure of which is the same as for the 4–form perturbations. Writing

$$\delta A_{ij} = \zeta_{ij}\ e^{i(p_- v - p_+ u)}\mathcal{F}(x), \tag{4.47}$$

for some constant complex polarisation tensor $\zeta_{ij} = \zeta_{[ij]}$, gives

$$\Box\delta A_{ij} = \zeta_{ij}\ e^{i(p_- v - p_+ u)}\left[(2p_-p_+ + H(u,x)p_-^2)\mathcal{F}(x) + \partial_k\partial_k\mathcal{F}(x)\right] = 0. \tag{4.48}$$

The constraint (4.44) gives

$$\delta A_{ui} = \frac{i}{p_-}\zeta_{ji}\ e^{i(p_- v - p_+ u)}\partial_j \mathcal{F}(x), \tag{4.49}$$

and the field equation (4.46) is

$$\frac{i}{p_-}\zeta_{ji}\ e^{i(p_- v - p_+ u)}\partial_j \left[(2p_- p_+ + H(u,x)p_-^2)\mathcal{F}(x) + \partial_k\partial_k \mathcal{F}(x)\right] = 0, \tag{4.50}$$

so we see precisely the same structure as above.

5 Classical stability

In the above section, we showed that the linearized field equations effectively reduce to the problem of solving (4.6):

$$[2p_- p_+ + H(u,x)p_-^2]\phi(x) + \partial_k\partial_k\phi(x) = 0. \tag{5.1}$$

Solutions of this equation control the perturbations of all supergravity fields. So far we have considered those modes with real momentum p_- that also have real p_+. Here we will see that in fact *all* modes of real p_- have real p_+. This is done by finding the general solution to (4.6) which, using a separation of variables, comes down to a second order o.d.e. with two known, linearly independent solutions. Note that we have ignored an arbitrary function of u which could be added to the Ansätze above. That is, we could have taken

$$\Phi = e^{i(p_- v - p_+ u)}\mathcal{F}(x) + f(u), \tag{5.2}$$

and likewise for the other supergravity fields. This is a manifestation of the fact that $u =$ constant is not a Cauchy surface, but a null surface. However, treating it as a substitute Cauchy surface only misses those modes which travel along constant u [58], parallel to the wave front. The presence of such a function $f(u)$ is familiar in light-front studies [63] and is determined by the boundary condition that fields should vanish asymptotically, requiring $f(u) = 0$.

Let us consider the simplest case, taking $A_{ij} = \lambda_{(i)}\delta_{ij}$ with the eigenvalues $\lambda_{(i)} = \mu_{(i)}^2, i = 1, \ldots, n$ and $\lambda_{(i)} = -\mu_{(i)}^2, i = n+1, \ldots, D-2$. Separating variables as

$$\mathcal{F}(x) = F_1(x^1)\ldots F_n(x^n)G_1(y^1)\ldots G_{D-2-n}(y^{D-2-n}), \tag{5.3}$$

where we denote the directions associated with negative eigenvalues by $\{y^1, \ldots, y^{D-2-n}\}$, gives

$$F_{(i)}'' + \left(E_{(i)} - \mu_{(i)}^2 p_-^2 (x^i)^2\right)F_{(i)} = 0, \qquad G_{(i)}'' + \left(E_{(i)} + \mu_{(i)}^2 p_-^2 (y^i)^2\right)G_{(i)} = 0, \tag{5.4}$$

where

$$\sum_{i=1}^{D-2} E_{(i)} = p_+ p_-. \tag{5.5}$$

The equation for the $F_{(i)}$ is just the Schrödinger equation for a simple harmonic oscillator, whereas the equation for the $G_{(i)}$ has an *inverted* oscillator potential. Of course, this is the origin of the oscillatory and exponential behaviour in the geodesics and zero modes of the string as discussed above.

Asymptotically, as $|x|, |y| \to \infty$, we have

$$F_{(i)}(x^i) \to e^{\pm\frac{1}{2}\mu_{(i)}p_-(x^i)^2}, \qquad G_{(i)}(y^i) \to \frac{1}{\sqrt{y^i}}\cos\left(\frac{1}{2}\mu_{(i)}p_-(y^i)^2\right), \frac{1}{\sqrt{y^i}}\sin\left(\frac{1}{2}\mu_{(i)}p_-(y^i)^2\right), \tag{5.6}$$

for each $F_{(i)}(x^i)$ and $G_{(i)}(y^i)$. In the x^i directions (with positive eigenvalues), the modes are either exponentially damped, or are exponentially growing — these are the normalizable and non–normalizable modes of [35]. In the y^i directions (with negative eigenvalues), however, the solutions are oscillatory, the two signs giving left– and right–moving plane waves. The former are easy to deal with: taking

$$F_{(i)}(x^i) = e^{\pm\frac{1}{2}\mu_{(i)}p_-(x^i)^2} f_{(i)}(x^i), \tag{5.7}$$

gives

$$f''_{(i)} \pm 2\mu_{(i)}p_- x^i f'_{(i)} + (E_{(i)} \pm \mu_{(i)}p_-)f_{(i)} = 0, \tag{5.8}$$

which is of course solved in terms of Hermite polynomials, up to an overall constant, giving a normalizable solution [35, 33]

$$F_{(i)}(x^i) = c_n e^{-\frac{1}{2}\mu_{(i)}p_-(x^i)^2} H_n(\sqrt{\mu_{(i)}p_-}x^i), \qquad n = \frac{1}{2}\left(\frac{E_{(i)}}{\mu_{(i)}p_-} - 1\right). \tag{5.9}$$

For real n, *i.e.*, for real $E_{(i)}$, these solutions furnish a complete basis of normalizable modes solving the equation of motion in the x^i directions.

We now turn to consider the directions associated with negative eigenvalues. Upon defining $z^i = y^i/\alpha_{(i)}$, where $\alpha^2_{(i)} = 1/(2\mu_{(i)}|p_-|)$, the equation for the $G_{(i)}$ in (5.4) becomes

$$G''_{(i)} + \left(\frac{1}{4}(z^i)^2 - a_{(i)}\right)G_{(i)} = 0, \tag{5.10}$$

where $a_{(i)} = -E_{(i)}\alpha^2_{(i)}$. This can be solved in terms of parabolic cylinder functions giving, for each z^i, two independent solutions [64]

$$\psi_a(z) = W(a, z), \qquad \chi_a(z) = W(a, -z). \tag{5.11}$$

The first solution has the limiting behaviour

$$\psi_a(z \to \infty) \quad \to \quad \sqrt{\frac{2k}{z}}\cos(z^2/4 - a\log z + \pi/4 + \varphi/2), \tag{5.12}$$

$$\psi_a(z \to -\infty) \quad \to \quad \sqrt{\frac{2}{k|z|}}\sin(z^2/4 - a\log|z| + \pi/4 + \varphi/2), \tag{5.13}$$

where $\varphi = \arg\Gamma(\frac{1}{2} + ia)$ and $k = \sqrt{1+\exp(2\pi a)} - \exp(\pi a)$, and the second behaves as

$$\chi_a(z \to \infty) \quad \to \quad \sqrt{\frac{2}{kz}} \sin(z^2/4 - a\log z + \pi/4 + \varphi/2), \tag{5.14}$$

$$\chi_a(z \to -\infty) \quad \to \quad \sqrt{\frac{2k}{|z|}} \sin(z^2/4 - a\log |z| + \pi/4 + \varphi/2), \tag{5.15}$$

To show that these functions are orthogonal, we write (5.10) as

$$G_a'' + \frac{1}{4}z^2 G_a = aG_a, \tag{5.16}$$

where G_a denotes either of the two functions in (5.11), multiply both sides by G_b and integrate by parts, giving

$$\int_{-L}^{L} G_a(z)G_b(z)\ \mathrm{d}z = \frac{1}{(a-b)} \left[G_b G_a' - G_a G_b'\right]_{-L}^{L}. \tag{5.17}$$

Taking the large L limit and using the limiting behaviour discussed above, we find

$$\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \psi_a(z)\psi_b(z)\ \mathrm{d}z = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \chi_a(z)\chi_b(z)\ \mathrm{d}z = 2\pi\sqrt{1+e^{2\pi a}}\ \delta(a-b). \tag{5.18}$$

Substituting instead for $G_a = \psi_a$ and $G_b = \chi_b$ gives

$$\int_{-L}^{L} \psi_a(z)\chi_b(z)\ \mathrm{d}z = \frac{1}{(a-b)} \left[\sqrt{\frac{k_b}{k_a}} - \sqrt{\frac{k_a}{k_b}}\right] \cos[(a-b)\log L]. \tag{5.19}$$

For $a = b + \epsilon$, with ϵ small,

$$k_a = k_b + \pi\epsilon \left[\frac{e^{2\pi b}}{\sqrt{1+e^{2\pi b}}} - e^{\pi b}\right], \tag{5.20}$$

which shows that

$$\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \psi_a(z)\chi_b(z)\ \mathrm{d}z = \frac{\pi e^{\pi a}}{\sqrt{1+e^{2\pi a}}}\delta_{ab}, \tag{5.21}$$

where δ_{ab} is the Kronecker delta. We can then write an arbitrary function as

$$G(z) = \int \mathrm{d}a[\alpha(a)\psi_a(z) + \beta(a)\chi_a(z)] \tag{5.22}$$

where α and β are found using the orthogonality relations

$$\alpha(a) = \frac{1}{2\pi\sqrt{1+\exp(2\pi a)}} \int \mathrm{d}z \psi_a(z) G(z), \qquad \beta(a) = \frac{1}{2\pi\sqrt{1+\exp(2\pi a)}} \int \mathrm{d}z \chi_a(z) G(z). \tag{5.23}$$

To recap, in the directions associated with negative eigenvalues we found solutions in terms of cylinder functions and in the directions associated with positive eigenvalues we found solutions in terms of Hermite polynomials. If the parameters a and n are real then these form a complete basis and we may use the orthogonality of these functions to decompose any initial data set in terms of modes with real a, n. However, real a, n implies real $E_{(i)}$ and with it, from (5.5), real p_+. That is, an arbitrary initial perturbation profile is composed of modes with real p_+, and so the system would seem to be stable.

To clarify the above, let us consider what happens in the more familiar case of a free scalar field with negative (mass)^2:

$$-\partial_t^2\varphi + \partial_x^2\varphi + \partial_y^2\varphi + m^2\varphi = 0. \tag{5.24}$$

To follow an analogue of the above argument we consider a mode of momentum p_x,

$$\varphi(t, x, y) = A(y)\cos(\omega t - p_x x) + B(y)\cos(\omega t - p_x x), \tag{5.25}$$

giving

$$\partial_y^2 A(y) = -(\omega^2 + m^2 - p_x^2)A(y) = -p_y^2 A(y), \tag{5.26}$$

with a similar equation for $B(y)$. The solutions to this are either exponential or trigonometric, depending on the reality of p_y – for normalizable solutions we need to take real momentum, p_y, giving us trigonometric solutions. We are now able, using standard Fourier analysis, to decompose an arbitrary initial perturbation in terms of this basis of real p_x, p_y. This is the analogue of being able to write solutions to (4.6) in terms of cylinder functions with real a and Hermite polynomials with real n. The difference now is that $\omega^2 = \underline{p}^2 - m^2$, so small momentum (long wavelength) states have imaginary ω whereas for the plane–wave we found that p_+ was always real.

One should be careful, however, since there are subtleties associated with the lack of a true Cauchy surface (some of which are discussed in [41]), although the same conclusions are reached in that work. As we have mentioned above, it would seem that evolving initial data from a u = constant surface only misses modes which are unlikely to exhibit unstable behaviour, since they are unaffected by the wave.

6 Conclusions

The propagation of a closed string in the light–cone gauge on the vacuum plane–wave gives rise to world–sheet scalars with a tachyonic mass. In particular, the zero mode of the string, which determines the supergravity modes, suffers from such a mass term; this motivated the study of the classical stability of the supergravity solution. Although such spacetimes are supersymmetric, and supersymmetry is usually understood to imply stability, the standard arguments do not apply as the metrics are not asymptotically flat (they are Lorentzian symmetric spaces). It may turn out however that such methods could be modified to cover the plane–wave, and this would be an interesting avenue of research.

Taking the IIB equations of motion, perturbed around the vacuum plane wave, we have shown that in a gauge suited to the spacetime (light–cone gauge) the system boils down to the study of a single equation, (4.6). The simplicity of this equation allowed us to find its general solution in terms of known functions. Moreover, an arbitrary initial perturbation was seen to be decomposable in terms of modes with real p_+, corresponding to oscillatory motion, and thereby providing strong evidence for the stability of the spacetime.

Of course, one would like to be able to *prove* that instabilities do not exist, by showing that there are no normalizable solutions of (4.6) with imaginary p_+. Unfortunately, however, we have not been able to do this.

On general grounds, one might suspect that the presence of tachyonic worldsheet scalars would not give rise to any instabilities of the background, for the simple reason that the mass of these scalars is purely an artifact of choosing the light–cone gauge on the worldsheet [25, 39]. Choosing instead, for example, the static gauge, gives rise to a worldsheet theory of massless but interacting scalars [39]. Indeed, simply changing from Brinkman to Rosen coordinates in the background spacetime has a similar effect on the worldsheet. It would be interesting to investigate how the interactions in different coordinates or gauges mimic the effect of a mass, tachyonic or otherwise.

Acknowledgements

We are very grateful to Don Marolf for many enlightening discussions, and for providing us with an early copy of the preprint [41], and to Simon Ross for a critical reading of this manuscript. DB would further like to thank Rob Myers and Moshe Rozali for interesting conversations, and is supported in part by NSERC. PMS is supported by a PPARC fellowship.

References

[1] D. Amati and C. Klimcik. *Phys. Lett.*, B219:443, 1989.

[2] G. T. Horowitz and A. R. Steif. *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 64:260, 1990.

[3] G. T. Horowitz and A. R. Steif. *Phys. Rev.*, D42:1950, 1990.

[4] J. Kowalski-Glikman. *Phys. Lett.*, B134:194, 1984.

[5] J. M. Figueroa-O'Farrill and G. Papadopoulos. *JHEP*, 0108:036, 2001. [hep-th/0105308].

[6] M. Blau, J. Figueroa-O'Farrill, C. Hull, and G. Papadopoulos. *JHEP*, 0201:047, 2002. [hep-th/0110242].

[7] M. Blau, J. Figueroa-O'Farrill, C. Hull, and G. Papadopoulos. *Class. Quant. Grav.*, 19:L87, 2002. [hep-th/0201081].

[8] M. Blau, J. Figueroa-O'Farrill, and G. Papadopoulos. *Class. Quant. Grav.*, 19:4753, 2002. [hep-th/0202111].

[9] R. R. Metsaev. *Nucl. Phys*, B625:70, 2002. [hep-th/0112044].

[10] R. R. Metsaev and A. A. Tseytlin. *Phys. Rev.*, D65:126004, 2002. [hep-th/0202109].

[11] D. Berenstein, J. Maldacena, and H. Nastase. *JHEP*, 0204:013, 2002. [hep-th/0202021].

[12] J. Maldacena. *Adv. Theor. Math. Phys.*, 2:231, 1998. [hep-th/9711200].

[13] S. S. Gubser, I. R. Klebanov, and A. M. Polyakov. *Phys. Lett.*, B428:105, 1998. [hep-th/9802109].

[14] E. Witten. *Adv. Theor. Math. Phys.*, 2:253, 1998. [hep-th/9802150].

[15] R. Penrose. In M. Cahen and M. Flato, editors, *Differential geometry and relativity*, page 271. D. Reidel, Dordrecht, 1976.

[16] R. Güven. *Phys. Lett.*, B482:255, 2000. [hep-th/0005061].

[17] I. R. Klebanov and E. Witten. *Nucl. Phys.*, B536:199, 1998. [hep-th/9807080].

[18] N. Itzhaki, I. R. Klebanov, and S. Mukhi. *JHEP*, 0203:048, 2002. [hep-th/0202153].

[19] J. Gomis and H. Ooguri. *Nucl. Phys.*, B635:106, 2002. [hep-th/0202157].

[20] L. A. Pando Zayas and J. Sonnenschein. *JHEP*, 0205:010, 2002. [hep-th/0202186].

[21] D. Z. Freedman, S. S. Gubser, K. Pilch, and N. P. Warner. *Adv. Theor. Math. Phys.*, 3:363, 1999. [hep-th/9904017].

[22] K. Pilch and N. P. Warner. *Phys. Lett.*, B487:22, 2000. [hep-th/0002192].

[23] K. Pilch and N. P. Warner. *Adv. Theor. Math. Phys.*, 4:627, 2002. [hep-th/0006066].

[24] R. Corrado, N. Halmagyi, K. D. Kennaway, and N. P. Warner. Penrose Limits of RG Fixed Points and PP-Waves with Background Fluxes. 2002. [hep-th/0205314].

[25] E. G. Gimon, L. A. Pando Zayas, and J. Sonnenschein. 2002. [hep-th/0206033].

[26] S. Bhattacharya and S. Roy. Penrose limit and NCYM theories in diverse dimensions. 2002. [hep-th/0209054].

[27] S. Bhattacharya and S. Roy. More on Penrose limits and non-local theories. 2002. [hep-th/0210072].

[28] D. Brecher, C. V. Johnson, K. J. Lovis, and R. C. Myers. *JHEP*, 0210:008, 2002. [hep-th/0206045].

[29] U. Gürsoy, C. Núñez, and M. Schvellinger. *JHEP*, 0206:015, 2002. [hep-th/0203124].

[30] V. E. Hubeny, M. Rangamani, and E. Verlinde. *JHEP*, 0210:020, 2002. [hep-th/0205258].

[31] H. Fuji, K. Ito, and Y. Sekino. Penrose Limit and String Theories on Various Brane Backgrounds. 2002. [hep-th/0209004].

[32] S. Ryang. Penrose Limits of Branes and Marginal Intersecting Branes. 2002. [hep-th/0209218].

[33] S. R. Das, C. Gomez, and S.-J. Rey. *Phys. Rev.*, D66:046002, 2002. [hep-th/0203164].

[34] E. Kiritsis and B. Pioline. *JHEP*, 0208:048, 2002. [hep-th/0204004].

[35] R. G. Leigh, K. Okuyama, and M. Rozali. *Phys. Rev.*, D66:046004, 2002. [hep-th/0204026].

[36] D. Berenstein and H. Nastaste. On lightcone string field theory from Super Yang-Mills and holography. 2002. [hep-th/0205048].

[37] D. Marolf and S. F. Ross. Plane Waves: To infinity and beyond! 2002. [hep-th/0208197].

[38] Y. Oz and T. Sakai. *Phys. Lett.*, B544:321, 2002. [hep-th/0207223].

[39] M. Cvetič, H. Lü, C. N. Pope, and K. S. Stelle. Linearly-realised Worldsheet Supersymmetry in pp-wave Background. 2002. [hep-th/0209193].

[40] M. Cahen and N. Wallach. *Bull. Am. Math. Soc.*, 76:585, 1970.

[41] D. Marolf and L. A. Pando Zayas. On the Singularity Structure and the Stability of Plane Waves. 2002. [hep-th/0210309].

[42] N. Kaloper, R. C. Myers, and H. Roussel. *Phys. Rev.*, D55:7625, 1997. [hep-th/9612248].

[43] G. T. Horowitz and H. Yang. *Phys. Rev.*, D55:7618, 1997. [hep-th/9701077].

[44] R. C. Myers. *Gen. Rel. Grav.*, 29:1217, 1997. [gr-qc/9705065].

[45] S. Ross. *JHEP*, 9808:003, 1998. [hep-th/9710158].

[46] D. Brecher, A. Chamblin, and H. S. Reall. *Nucl. Phys.*, B607:155, 2001. [hep-th/0012076].

[47] P. Bain, P. Meessen, and M. Zamaklar. Supergravity solutions for D-branes in Hpp-wave backgrounds. 2002. [hep-th/0205106].

[48] G. W. Gibbons and S. W. Hawking. *Phys. Rev.*, D15:2738, 1977.

[49] S. W. Hawking and I. G. Moss. *Phys. Lett.*, B110:35, 1982.

[50] R. W. Wald. *Phys. Rev.*, D28:2118, 1982.

[51] E. Witten. *Commun. Math. Phys.*, 80:381, 1981.

[52] G.W. Gibbons and C. M. Hull. *Phys. Lett.*, B109:190, 1982.

[53] G. W. Gibbons, C.M. Hull, and N.P. Warner. *Nucl. Phys.*, B218:173, 1983.

[54] G. W. Gibbons, D. Kastor, L. A. J. London, P.K.Townsend, and J. Traschen. *Nucl. Phys.*, B416:850, 1994. [hep-th/9310118].

[55] J. M. Figueroa-O'Farrill. *Class. Quant. Grav.*, 17:2925, 2000. [hep-th/9904124].

[56] M. Cvetič, H. Lü, and C. N. Pope. Penrose Limits, PP-Waves and Deformed M2-branes. 2002. [hep-th/0203082].

[57] M. Cvetič, H. Lü, and C. N. Pope. *Nucl. Phys.*, B644:65, 2002. [hep-th/0203229].

[58] G. W. Gibbons. *Commun. Math. Phys.*, 45:191, 1975.

[59] R. Penrose. *Rev. Mod. Phys.*, 37:215, 1965.

[60] G. W. Gibbons and P. J. Ruback. *Phys. Lett.*, B171:390, 1986.

[61] J. H. Schwarz. *Nucl. Phys.*, B226:269, 1983.

[62] A. Lichnerowicz. *Propagateurs et commutateurs en relativité générale.* Institut des Hautes Études Scientifiques, 1961.

[63] T. Heinzl. Light-Cone Dynamics of Particles and Fields. 1998. [hep-th/9812190].

[64] M. Abramowitz and I. A. Stegun, editors. *Handbook of Mathematical Functions with Formulas, Graphs and Mathematical Tables.* National Bureau of Standards, 1964.